

# Promoting Inclusive (and Dialogic) Leadership in Higher Education Institutions

Jacqueline B. Temple<sup>a\*</sup> and Jari Ylitalo<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA; Helsinki University of Technology, Helsinki, Finland*

Higher education institutions are facing major challenges requiring traditional leadership and administrative policies and practices to be rethought and renewed. These challenges concern the whole academic community but mostly the institutions' administrative leaders. This article suggests how applying the democratic principles of "inclusion", which stresses critical dialogue and social justice, can reach beyond the traditional managerial and administrative policies when meeting the new requirements; and be a catalyst for change in leadership practices.

A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secure flexible readjustments of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder. (John Dewey, 1916, p. 17)

## Introduction

The academic leadership in higher education institutions are facing new challenges globally. The institutions and their leadership must address multiple demands due to changes in the external environment, faculties, and student demographic population shifts (Henkel, 2002; Milliken, 1998; Strathe & Wilson, 2006). The academic communities both students and faculties are more diverse than ever. Responding to this diversity is the concern of the academic communities as a whole, but most of all, it is the leaderships' roles, cultural practices, and policies that must be addressed.

\*Corresponding author. Portland State University, PO Box 751, Portland, OR, USA. Email: templej@pdx.edu

The academic leaders and administrators in different roles and positions are the key figures to enable new cultures and community practices to emerge.

Transforming the traditional top-down administrative and managerial leadership approaches requires nurturing productive cross-cultural alliances and collaboration. Global interconnectedness where decisions have broad implications suggests that an inclusive approach where dialogue is essential can provide the leaders with the necessary capabilities and practical approaches needed to resolve problems cooperatively (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). Allen (2006) argues that if academic leaders agree that universities are places of possibility, then they must involve themselves and their institutions in social and cultural change. In so doing, an examination of their underlying assumptions about cultural and ethnic diversity is essential.

Nevertheless, the efforts to change higher educational governance and leadership practices have often failed and the traditional management model has prevailed over more innovative approaches (Lipman-Blumen, 1996; Marzano, Walters & McNulty, 2005; Senge, 2001). Leadership and its development have not traditionally been issues in academic institutions. In many cases ending up in an administrative role has not been something that faculty members eagerly desire. The case is often that now it is your turn "to be the first among equals" (Strathe & Wilson, 2006). The administrative roles are not so much valued among the academic professionals. They are often considered as a necessary evil (Boylan, 2005). Furthermore, many fear that it will restrict their autonomy, because they equate leadership to control (Milliken, 1998). New academic leadership practices integrating the strengths of collegial traditions to more post-modern ideas of collaborative and inclusive leadership should be pursued to meet the new challenges.

Globalisation and changing demographics has a profound impact on higher education leadership policies and practices. As the world becomes more diverse, the need for intercultural communication and social justice sensitivity increases. Thus, traditional leadership preparation programmes provide only token consideration to the issues and concerns of social justice (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). This managerial assembly-line model developed decades ago, in response to a relatively homogeneous student and faculty population, does not prepare administrative leaders to critically address the nature of social justice and intercultural understanding (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Nor, does it foster a climate of change, or an understanding of democracy and freedom in the broader diverse society.

Multiple institutional inequities permeate the entrenched existing hierarchal leadership model. As the efficacy of existing forms of leadership is questioned, specific concerns are raised about the extent to which social justice issues are being considered in the development of new leadership approaches (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005) and institutional policies. If we are serious about change, we must acknowledge and examine the broader issues embedded in a legacy of social injustice. Thus, it will take a new type of leadership to enable administrators to be accepting of differing cultural values in teaching and learning; as well as creating policies that are empowering to all students and faculty.

Therefore, this article examines inclusive academic leadership: what is it, why it is needed, and how could it be promoted. It is representative of the data from our research paper presented at the EAIR conference 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark, which explored how the democratic ideals of inclusion could “transform inequitable and oppressive institutional policies and relations” (Burbeles & Beck, 1999, p. 57) in higher education. Central to this discussion here are the ways in which administrators understood, in that study, and defined what it means to be an inclusive leader.

To explore these concepts, we begin with our theoretical perspective which provides the foundation for the inquiry. Then, we discuss the background of inclusion and delineate its’ multiple definitions. Next, we present a critique of relevant literature on the traditional models of leadership development and contrast this model with the characteristics of an inclusive leader. Finally, in new directions, we conclude with a discussion of the implications and offer recommendations, derived from the results of the research, for inclusive leadership practices in academic institutions.

### **Critical Perspective**

This research was guided by critical inquiry, which addresses the social, economic, and political relations among people. This lens served as the foundation for critical reflection and conscious action in examining how four academic administrators could reframe what they thought about their governance policies and institutional practices. Critical inquiry looks at the larger picture by investigating the social and political contexts of issues (Henderson & Kesson, 2004). It emphasises democratic ideals, dialogue, praxis (actions), and a critical understanding of socio-economic and political conditions (Shor, 1993). Critical dialogue instigated a discussion about language, culture, disability, and racial issues (Giroux, as cited in Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003) in the academy. In the process the administrators “confronted and unmasked the beliefs and practices that limit human freedom, justice, and democracy” (Mills, 2007, p. 16). They discussed their social justice responsibilities and how their traditional leadership methods demonstrated a particular version of what knowledge is of most worth, what it means to know something, and how the representations of themselves and others; and the teaching and learning environments are constructed (Giroux, 1997).

In so doing the participating administrators were able to gain an understanding of the social, economic, and political context of issues (Henderson & Kesson, 2004). From these understandings they identified the barriers in the existing institutional governance policies and revealed how they could cultivate equitable (Allen, 2006) leadership practices; and institute transformational and inclusive policies.

### **Traditional Models of Academic Leadership—Current realities**

During the past 20–30 years there have been increased transformational demands set for academic communities. Earlier leadership positions have not been the most



wanted roles among the academic professionals (e.g. Strathe & Wilson, 2006). Traditionally university management or managerial roles have referred those in top positions and management has been seen merely as administration and collegial decision-making (Smith, 2005). Members of the organisation have not possibly even known who the leaders are. How to take care of the leadership has been everybody's own choice. There have not been any demands for collective leadership guidelines. This has led to quite large variety of leadership realities at the universities (Kekäle, 1997).

However, recent changes in academic organisations have emphasised the role of middle level academic leaders and set quite new demands on their everyday practices (Linjakumpu, 2008). The new demands concern both quality and effectiveness of the academic work. The middle level leaders must at the same time be and act as managers of their units and leaders of the academic work (Sotirakou, 2004). This set new and somehow controversial demands to build identities, roles, and competencies of academic leadership on various levels of the universities. The challenge is to fit together traditional academic freedom and demands of effectiveness in a situation where the basic concept of "new academic leader and leadership" is still underdeveloped (Linjakumpu, 2008). She states that we have moved from the era of non-leadership to the era of management in which effectiveness and hierarchical control are key elements, and argues that this kind of managerial approach cannot respond to the new demands universities are facing.

When it seems that there is an increasing need for more active leadership and management roles in the universities, a crucial question is how to find willing and capable people to take care of these roles? The management positions have traditionally been temporary roles and in many cases seen as an unwelcome interruption to research career. Professors serving their institutions as collegially chosen heads do not identify themselves very strongly managers (Henkel, 2002). However, being successful in leadership and management roles require both willingness and capability to take the role seriously. Henkel (2002) points out that the academics in leadership positions often times have ambivalent thoughts and feelings about their management roles, are they managers or academics?

As the requirements for new academic leadership becomes clearer also understanding of needed leadership development processes will emerge. However, adopting and systemising leadership development practices as an elementary part of everyday life of academic organisations is still in its early stages. Milliken (1998) points out that the development of the necessary leadership in universities requires first the recognition of the needed leadership, and then a wide acceptance of the appropriate leadership tasks and roles. After that the leadership competences and practices can be developed. So far the burden to define the leadership roles have been strongly on the individuals and systematic training is still rare (Henkel, 2002).

The universities are facing globally requirements for more conscious leadership roles and practices. However, there are complexities and even paradoxes in these requirements. How to preserve the academic freedom and autonomy and at the same time build in more accountability and performance criteria? How to balance



competition between individuals to collaboration between units and disciplines? How to take care that all members of the academic community will have equal treatment and at the same time promote those who seem to have best possibilities to achieve top results? There is a threat that exclusive, hierarchical, and control based management practices adopted from the business arena will take over. In this climate, leaders desiring to create inclusive, just policies, are constrained by rules, regulations, and structural controls (Foster, 2004). We argue that it is vital to reach beyond the temptation to imitate current business models and build such leadership practices and realities that enable the universities to flourish in their unique roles in globalised world. The leadership needed must be based on the democratic principles of inclusion and dialogue.

### **Background and Definitions of Inclusion**

In the US, inclusion was the outgrowth of the Civil Rights movement designed to move students at the margins of education into the integrated general education environment (Rynak, Jackson, & Billingsley, 1999, 2000). Researchers such as Biklen (1992) and Klierer (1998) discussed systemic change as a component of inclusion (Wolery, Werts, Caldwell, Synder, & Lisowski, 1995). They defined it as a place where everyone belongs, is accepted, and is supported by peers and other members of the community (Stainback & Stainback, 1990). This leads to the creation of supportive educational communities to meet the individual needs of *all* students. Internationally, inclusive education is defined broader as reform that supports and welcomes diversity among all students (Kugelmass, 2006). The underlying aim is to eliminate social exclusion and to ensure basic human rights in response to diversity in race, social class, ethnicity, religion, gender, and ability (Kugelmass, 2006). In both definitions equity and social justice are at the core. Accordingly this definition is not universal in all arenas.

Beyond the special and general education k-12 literature, inclusion has not been viewed as a catalyst for resounding change in the policies and practices in higher education. Nor has it been broadly defined within the leadership arena. It appears that this line of inquiry seems to have been mostly neglected by administrative studies in general (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Much of the literature dwells on leaders and leadership structures, their roles, and what leaders do in broad and general terms (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a, 1996b). Such accounts pay little attention to a deeper understanding of how and why leaders act (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Having a rich understanding of how and why they act in various ways is essential if the research is to contribute to improving the day-to-day practice of leaders (Spillane & Diamond, 2007) and leadership development.

The term "inclusion" is a philosophically laden, complex concept that has many uses and interpretations in the literature and in the field. The lack of clarity in the definition and its various uses frequently leads to confusion and miscommunication. For example, in the special education literature the focus has been on the levels of integration of students with differing learning abilities, where their academic needs

are facilitated and supported using a trans-disciplinary team approach (Sailor, 1991). In contrast others define it as an educational place or structure where the general education curriculum is presented to students with/without disabilities in one setting (Siegel-Causey & Allinder, 1998). On the other hand, some refer to "inclusive" as the service, while others use "inclusion" to describe heterogeneous groupings as opposed to homogeneous grouping of students (Daniels & Vaughn, 1999; Stanovich, 1999).

In the leadership arena, inclusive leadership it is a collective process in which organisational members engage effectively in leadership roles and processes (McCauley, Moxley, & van Velsor, 1998). The roles refer to those that come with and without formal authority; while the processes are those that enable groups to work together in meaningful ways (Day, 2001). As an ongoing process, inclusion is the step that many educational systems and institutions can take to ensure that all students begin to learn that access to education and belonging is a right, not a privileged status that is earned (Kunc, 1992); and that every person has a contribution to offer the world. In the leadership literature, Helgeson (1990, 1995), also refers to inclusion as an interactive charismatic model of leadership, where power is redistributed throughout an organisation. In this web-like egalitarian structure of interaction, the leader strengthens ties by leveling the authoritarian landscape and removing barriers, which makes everyone feel included and emphasises that everyone gets a fair chance to influence decisions, practices, and policies (Ryan, 2006).

For our purpose, inclusion is defined as a social justice construct that interrupts the legacy of racial, language, cultural and disability and it equalises opportunities for marginalised members of society. This definition is informed by the democratic principles of belonging, critical dialogue; and the stakeholders' perspectives being valued in the decision-making process. When applied to social situations, inclusion consistently considers to what extent those deemed as "others" have been "excluded" from social, economic, political, cultural, or educational systems (Ryan, 2006).

Because leadership affects many lives, an inclusive leader and administrator serves as the bridge for forging cross-cultural alliances, practices, and procedures. In so doing, the leader invites diverse stakeholders to the table to resolve differences (Heifetz, 1994), and to work together in moving policies forward. In this manner leaders and administrators resemble what Senge (1990) refers to as an organisation that is continually expanding its capacity in response to the challenges it encounters.

### **Promoting a Catalyst for Change in Higher Education Institutions**

As the literature indicates, leadership is an emergent property of a social system, not something that is added to an existing system. Leadership cannot be developed from outside in but within the system and between the people who form the system (Day, 2001). Hernez-Broome and Hughes (2004) emphasise that leadership should be understood as the collective capacity of all members of an organisation. Creating inclusive and dialogic leadership requires administrators to critically engage and

collaboratively mobilise colleagues to act on new ideas, and to challenge conventional thinking (Jones, 2006). Such leaders become border crossers in building a community of difference based on intercultural communication.

Since universities are considered political environments where power, resources, relationships, and cultures are interwoven into the organisational theory, the ideals of inclusion cannot be had without the leaders' willingness to change (Blasé, 1991). This type of inclusive leadership speaks to an orientation towards dialogue and critical inquiry in enhancing cross-cultural communication and collaboration within the organisations and between different stakeholders (Kekäle & Pirttilä, 2006). We believe that future academic leadership at its best must be inclusive, empowering, and purposeful. Furthermore, we see that the inclusive and dialogic approach to leadership and leadership development would add significant practical and conceptual value to the development of future academic institutions.

A crucial question in every organisation is how to find potential leaders and how to nurture their growth and development on leadership path? In academic organisation this can be an even trickier question because probably not too many new Ph.D.s have set academic administration as a career aspiration (Strathe & Wilson, 2006). A common question of leadership used to be: are leaders born or made? Some contemporary writings suggest that leaders are both born and made (e.g. Conger, 2004). Many factors influence the process of becoming a leader. These are for example genetic predisposition, family environment, school experiences, hardships, job experiences, organisational incentives, and training. Despite the fact that the foundation for effective leadership capability is formed through early life experiences, later experiences can play a crucial role in the development process (Conger, 2004). In academic context ending up in an authority position differs from the way people become leaders in business contexts. In academic organisations ending up in an administrative role can sometimes be seen as a side track. In the business context climbing the career ladder is the primary target for at least some people. The academic leadership position is often considered as a temporary role—a place to which a professor goes to and comes from (Strathe & Wilson, 2006).

Practical experience is the most important learning mechanism for the managers on behalf of their leadership abilities (Akin, 1987; McCall, 2004). This is the case also in academic leadership roles. McCall (2004) points out that development experiences are related to something new and unknown, or even unfamiliar, to a person. Challenging assignments, exposure to other people, hardships, and personal events are potential sources for fruitful learning experiences (Conger, 2004; McCall, 2004). However, individuals will learn differently from even similar situations. This is due to different prior experience and whether their styles and the context of the experience promote learning (McCall, 2004). Learning does not follow experiences automatically but also conscious reflection of the experiences is needed (Raelin, 2004).

Ensuring adequate leadership talent and capability in an organisation should be considered as a strategic issue. Building leadership capability is a long term process. It will not happen at once. The complexity of the knowledge, skills, and ability



required in high level jobs is such that one should consider decades instead of years. There is no one single method or a short to-do list to ensure adequate leadership talent in organisation. The development efforts should be taken as increasing probabilities more than as a linear and certain process from A to B (McCall, 2004). In universities ensuring the adequate leadership talent in a long term has not traditionally been an issue but in the future this should also be considered as a strategic prerequisite for a long term success of the university. Presidents and provosts must take roles as "chief leadership development officers".

Leadership development feedback affects how people think about themselves not just their interactions with others. Thus, the feedback can lead to re-evaluations in many aspects of person's life, not just those issues that are directly connected to his or her role as a leader. Leadership development should have an impact on the person as a whole. It can be considered that leadership development should involve the development of the whole person (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004). One of the utmost important requirements for a contemporary manager is to learn about oneself, be able to make necessary changes, and be able to cope with the associated stress and emotions. A new manager can master the human competencies needed in the job only with self-awareness, empathy, discipline, and practice (Hill, 2004). If the leadership role is taken as a temporary assignment an individual rarely has a strong motivation to start developing own leadership competencies. The leadership in the academic context should be considered from a wider perspective and not connect it solely to the authority roles. The professors manifest leadership in various situations and roles as educators, mentors, counsellors, and committee members.

The impact of formal training programmes on behalf of actual leadership development has been questioned (McCall, 2004; Raelin, 2004). New leadership development approaches and application have emerged due to the notion that leadership is rooted and built in the context and more effectively leadership can be developed within the organisations and connected to organisational realities. As leadership related competencies are learned through experiential learning in the context, the development approaches have been integrated to actual work experiences and practices. Furthermore, as the nature of the development is continuous process instead of separate incidents, the emphasis is to improve the opportunities to learn from the real life experiences. Thus, leadership development is currently more a process to help people to learn from their work than taking them away from their work to learn (Moxley & O'Connor, 1998).

The more and more common methods for leadership and leader development besides formal training programmes are 360-degree feedback, work assignments, action learning, mentoring, coaching, and networking (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004; Day 2001). It is argued that the effectiveness and appropriateness of any developmental approach is more dependent on its applicability to the context and the way it is implemented, than the actual method per se. More important is how well the application of leadership development fits in the overall organisational culture and the developmental stage, and how well the application is integrated and systemised as a part of the other organisational practices. When developing inclusive

and dialogic leadership the developmental processes must be inclusive and dialogic as well.

There is no magic bullet or a to-do list that will guarantee an adequate supply of leadership talent. The success is based on systematic, long-term hard work, and ongoing dialogue. Like other aspects of social systems and human learning, leadership development is also a matter of probabilities. Improvement will come in the form of increased probabilities (McCall, 2004). Leadership development should be regarded as a strategic issue and the presidents, rectors, and deans should have an active role in promoting leadership practices, competences, and culture in their universities. Leadership development cannot be delegated if taken seriously.

In comparison to traditional leadership, which many define as a set of strategies; inclusive leadership is more of a body of successful practices which can provide insights into possibilities that might otherwise pass unnoticed (Hart, 1996). This is in contrast to the traditional individualistic model of leadership in which one person takes full responsibility to make things happen in the organisation.

Integral to inclusive leadership are the sense of purpose in collective decision-making, and the importance of the creation of a problem solving culture that involves using each others experiences and resources (Ainscow, 1999). When people who are provided with an opportunity to engage in participatory decision-making processes, they are likely to take ownership of those decisions and in turn promote cooperative actions than if decisions were imposed on them (Thousand et al., 1986). Finally, besides contributing to the practical organisational outcomes, inclusive leaders must continuously improve the sense of belonging in the community (Ryan 2006, p. 17) by listening and giving voice, and by transforming traditional leadership practices into a culture where building a community for change is essential.

However, inclusive leadership is not a panacea for all of our academic and social ills. It does not come with a problem-solving road map. But it has the benefit of provoking discussion about how to construct needs like belonging and serving the common good. It requires administrators who are reflective, life-long learners willing to develop new habits of behaviours. Inclusive leadership demands the courage to face challenges, adapt, and cultivate changes in attitudes (Heifetz, 1994). The implication is that the inclusion of competing value perspectives is essential to the organisations' adaptive success in facing tough realities and challenges to produce socially useful outcomes (Heifetz, 1994).

### *New Directions*

Global interconnectedness where decisions have broad implications (Lipman-Blumen, 1996) makes inclusive leadership an essential and critical issue. In leadership the challenge is to meet unpredictable situations and the capability to adapt to internal and external changes. Within a social justice framework, administrators are called upon to be transformational leaders who can blur the boundaries of race, language, culture, and disability to engage in critical analysis of historical inequities and who can work to change institutional structures (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005).



An inclusive approach is a holistic issue that stems from a mindset, values, and a willingness that must be authentic—it cannot be forced. In so doing, inclusive leadership improves the human condition in that it raises the consciousness of administrators in developing a systematic multicultural world view. Promoting a world view means that administrators are driven by their assumptions and beliefs that all students have the inherent right to be educated. And that it is their responsibility to initiate strategies that emphasise co-operation, consensus building, and collaborative dialogue of belonging instead of competition (Allen, 2006). When people who are provided with an opportunity to engage in participatory decision-making processes, they are likely to take ownership of those decisions and in turn promote cooperative actions than if decisions were imposed on them (Thousand et al., 1986).

Inclusion is something that is sensed and experienced—hence, it cannot be measured by objective means. Thus, the collective capacity that is built through leadership development must also include perspectives of mutual learning, sense-making, and anticipation of unforeseen challenges (Day, 2001). Such an orientation can become an effective practice in combating discriminatory attitudes by creating welcoming communities, and improving efficiency in higher education administrators.

These implications suggest that an inclusive approach to governance can honour the integrity of domestic and international students. The ultimate benefit will be administrators who are responsive to an array of academic, cultural, and linguistic needs of a diverse student body and faculty; and ultimately the development of democratic governance policies and practices in higher education institutions. The emerging social justice discourse requires leaders to question the assumptions that drive policies and practices to create equity. To meet this challenge inclusive leaders must critically examine and inquire into the taken-for-granted structures that can pose numerous barriers to student success (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). An inclusive perspective in leadership focuses on community and connection building in faculties instead of leading individuals separately and in isolation. The inclusive leadership practice means, in its simplest form, that those in authority roles say hello people when met in the corridor and take care that they pay their full attention to the person they are communicating with. But it also means continuous alertness of detecting covert mechanisms of exclusion within the organisation; and having the courage to speak the sometimes “hidden” unspeakable truths.

This study lends credence to being open to multiple perspectives in problem-solving a systemic phenomenon. The findings suggest an inclusive and dialogic approach extends far beyond the needs of students with disabilities. It also underscores a vital need for strategies that build mutual understanding in a global arena. As a process of supporting and empowering individuals within respective organisations, inclusive practices can provide a structure for linking diverse people together in educational environments; and reveal outcomes that reflect persistent social inequalities. The social and political problems in society are mirrored in higher education institutions. In response to these complexities, administrative leaders must understand how these dimensions are manifested in counterproductive policies (Tozer,



Violas, & Senese, 2002). As the efficacy of existing leadership models are questioned, specific concerns are raised about the extent to which social justice issues are integrated in new approaches and standards for leadership preparation programmes (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Just agreeing that social justice is critical is not enough (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2009). Administrators must live, embed, and question social justice inequities in their daily practice and governance policies.

In sum what administrators can and will do in their daily practice is the result of their experiences and philosophical beliefs regarding education, leadership, their students, and the inclusive process. Administrators, faculty, and students must address problems inherent in the infrastructure of "exclusionary" institutional policies and practices; and work to transform those. Promoting such policies could be the way that legitimises the knowledge and the experiences that diversity brings. Such a practice could be the vehicle to develop new modes of leadership that nurtures productive alliances in meeting the challenges of global education.

## References

- Ainscow, M. (1999). *Understanding the development of inclusive schools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Akin, G. (1987). Varieties of managerial learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(2), 36–48.
- Allen, L. A. (2006). The moral life of schools revisited: Preparing educational leaders to "build a new social order" for social justice and democratic community. *International Journal of Urban Educational Leadership*, 1(1), 1–13.
- Biklen, D. (1992). *Schools without labels: Parents, educators, and inclusive education*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Blasé, J. (1991). Everyday politics perspectives of teachers toward students: The dynamics of diplomacy. In J. Blasé (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation* (pp. 185–206). Newberry Park, CA: Sage.
- Boylan, E. (2005). Translating teaching skills to leadership roles. *Academic Leader*, 21(7), 3.
- Burbeles, N. C., & Beck, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. In T. S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 45–67). New York: Routledge.
- Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M. M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 201–222.
- Conger, J. A. (2004). Developing leadership capability: What's inside the black box? *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 136–139.
- Daniels, V. I., & Vaughn, S. (1999). A tool to encourage "best practice" in full inclusion. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 31(5), 48–55.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581–613.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Foster, W. P. (2004). The decline of the local: A challenge to educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(2), 176–191.
- Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996a). The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980–1995. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P.

- Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 723–783). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996b). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980–1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5–44.
- Hart, S. (1996). *Beyond special needs: Enhancing children's learning through innovative thinking*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: The Belnap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Helgeson, S. (1990). *The female advantage*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Helgeson, S. (1995). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Henderson, J., & Kesson, K. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom: Educational decisions in democratic societies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Henkel, M. (2002). Emerging concepts of academic leadership and their implications for intra-institutional roles and relationships in higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 37(1), 29–41.
- Hernez-Broome, G., & Hughes, R. I. (2004). Leadership development: Past, present, and future. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(1), 24–32.
- Hill, L. A. (2004). New manager development for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 121–126.
- Jones, A. (2006). Developing what? An anthropological look at the leadership development process across cultures. *Leadership*, 2, 481–498.
- Kekäle, J. (1997). *Leadership cultures in academic departments*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Joensuu, Joensuun yliopiston yhteiskuntatieteellisiä julkaisuja, no. 26. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.
- Kekäle, J., & Pirttilä, I. (2006). Participatory action research as a method for developing leadership and quality. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(3), 251–268.
- Kliwer, C. (1998). The meaning of inclusion. *Mental Retardation*, 36(4), 317–322.
- Kugelmass, J. (2006). Sustaining cultures of inclusion: The value and limitation of cultural analyses. *European Journal of Education*, 21(3), 279–292.
- Kunc, N. (1992). The need to belong: Rediscovering maslows' hierarchy of needs. In R. A. Villa, J.S. Thousand, W. Stainback, & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: An administrative guide to creating heterogeneous schools* (pp. 25–39). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Linjakumpu, A. (2008). Akateeminen johtajuus etsimässä paikkaansa—Tunnejohtaminen yliopistojen voimavaraksi? [Academic Leadership on Search—Emotional Leadership as a New Resource for the Universities]. *Tieteessä tapahtuu*, 7, 27–36 [in Finnish].
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *Connective leadership: Managing in a changing world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marzano, R. J., Walters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD; or Aurora, CO: McREL.
- McCall, M. W. (2004). Leadership development through experience. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 127–130.
- McCauley, C. D., Moxley, R. S., & van Velsor, E. (Eds.) (1998) *The Center of Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milliken, J. (1998). The cult of academic leadership. *Higher Education in Europe*, 23(4), 505–515.
- Moxley, R. S., & O'Connor, W. P. (1998) A systems approach to leadership development. In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley, & E. van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center of Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (pp. 217–241). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Raelin, J. A. (2004). Don't bother putting leadership into people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 131–135.
- Ryan, J. (2006). *Inclusive leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Rynak, D. L., Jackson, L., & Billingsley, F. (1999–2000). Defining school inclusion for students with moderate to severe disabilities: What do the experts say? *Exceptionality*, 8(2), 101–116.
- Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured schools. *Remedial and Special Education*, 12(6), 8–22.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2009). Developing social justice literacy: An open letter to our faculty colleagues. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(5), 345–352.
- Shor, I. (1993). *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Siegel-Causey, E., & Alinder, R. M. (1998). Using alternative assessment for students with severe disabilities: Alignment with best practices. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*, 33(2), 168–175.
- Smith, R. (2005). Departmental ILeadership and management in chartered and statutory universities. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 33(4), 449–464.
- Sotirakou, T. (2004). Coping with conflict within the entrepreneurial university: Threat or challenge for heads of departments in the UK higher education context. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 70(3), 345–372.
- Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York: Teachers College Colombia University.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1990). *Supportive networks for inclusive schooling. Interdependent, integrated education*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Stanovich, P. J. (1999). Conversations about inclusion. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 31(6), 54–58.
- Strathe, M. I., & Wilson, V. W. (2006). Academic leadership: The pathway to and from. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 134, Summer, 5–13.
- Thousand, J., Fox, T., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox, W. (1986). *The homecoming mode: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments* (Monograph No. 7–1). Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.
- Tozer, S. E., Violas, P. C., & Senese, G. (2002). *Schools and society: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wolery, M., Werts, M. G., Caldwell, N. K., Synder, E. D., & Lisowski, L. (1995). Experienced teachers' perceptions of resources and supports for inclusion. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*, 30(1), 15–26.



